

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments. Claims 1-19 remain pending in the case. Claims 1-19 are rejected. Claim 8 is amended herein. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Application 2002/232017 by Kyocera, hereinafter referred to as the “Kyocera” reference. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 1 are not anticipated by Kyocera in view of the following rationale.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A single light emitting diode package comprising:  
a standalone ceramic cavity comprising a substrate for mounting a light emitting diode in a single cavity and substantially vertical ceramic sidewalls for minimizing light leakage; and  
***a metallic coating on a portion of said ceramic substrate and a portion of said ceramic sidewalls for reflecting light in a predetermined direction.***

Kyocera and the claimed invention are very different. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that Kyocera does not teach “***a metallic coating on a portion of said ceramic substrate ... for reflecting light in a predetermined direction.***

***predetermined direction***" (emphasis added), as recited in Claim 1.

Examiner cites element 34 of Kyocera as teaching this limitation. However, element 34 does not extend onto the horizontal surface depicted in Figure 4 of Kyocera. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Kyocera does not teach "***a metallic coating on a portion of said ceramic substrate ... for reflecting light in a predetermined direction***" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Furthermore, due to the limited amount of translation provided, Applicants respectfully assert that Examiner has not provided an adequate basis for claiming that the cited elements of Figure 4 of Kyocera are what Examiner claims them to be. All portions of the provided translation that refer to specific figures and elements refer only to *Figure 1*. Stated differently, the provided translation gives no information or description relating to Figure 4 beyond merely providing the figure itself. Applicants respectfully assert that various features of Figure 4 could be subject to multiple interpretations by one of ordinary skill in the art. As such, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner provide additional proof for the rejection of Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Kyocera does not teach at least one limitation of the claimed embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent Claim 1, that this claim overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and is thus in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2, 8, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Application 2002/232017 by Kyocera, hereinafter referred to as the “Kyocera” reference, in view of United States Patent 3,821,590 by Kosman et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Kosman” reference. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 2, 8, and 14 are not rendered obvious by Kyocera and Kosman in view of the following rationale.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 8 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A method for manufacture of a light emitting diode package comprising:

forming a ceramic cavity comprising a ceramic substrate for mounting a light emitting diode in a single cavity and substantially vertical ceramic sidewalls for reducing light leakage;

***coating a portion of said ceramic substrate with a light reflective material;***

positioning a light emitting diode on said substrate; and

depositing an optically transparent material in said cavity to protect said light emitting diode.

Claim 14 recites similar limitations.

Kyocera and the claimed invention are very different. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that Kyocera does not teach or suggest “***coating a portion of said ceramic substrate with a light reflective material***” (emphasis added), as recited in Claim 8. Examiner cites element

34 of Kyocera as teaching this limitation. However, element 34 does not extend onto the horizontal surface depicted in figure 4 of Kyocera. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Kyocera does not teach or suggest ***“coating a portion of said ceramic substrate with a light reflective material”*** (emphasis added), as claimed.

Furthermore, due to the limited amount of translation provided, Applicants respectfully assert that Examiner has not provided an adequate basis for claiming that the cited elements of Figure 4 of Kyocera are what Examiner claims them to be. All portions of the provided translation that refer to specific figures and elements refer only to *Figure 1*. Stated differently, the provided translation gives no information or description relating to Figure 4 beyond merely providing the figure itself. Applicants respectfully assert that various features of Figure 4 could be subject to multiple interpretations by one of ordinary skill in the art. As such, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner provide additional proof for the rejection of Claims 8 and 14.

Applicants further submit that Kosman does not overcome the shortcomings of Kyocera. This is, Applicants respectfully assert that Kosman, alone or in combination with Kyocera, does not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 8 and 14 cited above.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Kyocera in view of Kosman does not teach or suggest at least one limitation of the claimed Serial No.: 10/669,986

Examiner: Payne, Sharon E.  
Art Unit: 2875

embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent Claims 8 and 14, that these claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are thus in condition for allowance.

Claim 2 is dependent on Claim 1 and recites additional limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Kosman does not overcome the shortcomings of Kyocera. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that Kosman, alone or in combination with Kyocera, does not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 cited above, and therefore Claim 1 is considered allowable over Kyocera and Kosman. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 2 is allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Application 2002/232017 by Kyocera, hereinafter referred to as the “Kyocera” reference, in view of United States Patent 4,600,977 by Barlian et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Barlian” reference. Claim 3 is dependent on Claim 1 and recites additional limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Barlian does not overcome the shortcomings of Kyocera. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that Barlian, alone or in combination with Kyocera, does not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 cited above, and therefore Claim 1 is considered allowable over Kyocera and Barlian. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 3 is allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Application 2002/232017 by Kyocera, hereinafter referred to as the “Kyocera” reference, in view of United States Patent 6,186,649 by Zou et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Zou” reference. Claims 4 and 5 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Zou does not overcome the shortcomings of Kyocera. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that Zou, alone or in combination with Kyocera, does not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 cited above, and therefore Claim 1 is considered allowable over Kyocera and Zou. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4 and 5 are allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Application 2002/232017 by Kyocera, hereinafter referred to as the “Kyocera” reference, in view of United States Patent 1,340,443 by Gleason et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Gleason” reference. Claim 6 is dependent on Claim 1 and recites additional limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Gleason does not overcome the shortcomings of Kyocera. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that Gleason, alone or in combination with Kyocera, does not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 cited above, and therefore Claim 1 is considered allowable over Kyocera and Gleason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully

submit that Claim 6 is allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Application 2002/232017 by Kyocera, hereinafter referred to as the “Kyocera” reference, in view of United States Patent 6,715,901 by Huang, hereinafter referred to as the “Huang” reference.

Claim 7 is dependent on Claim 1 and recites additional limitations.

Applicants respectfully submit that Huang does not overcome the shortcomings of Kyocera. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that Huang, alone or in combination with Kyocera, does not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 cited above, and therefore Claim 1 is considered allowable over Kyocera and Huang. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 7 is allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 9 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Application 2002/232017 by Kyocera, hereinafter referred to as the “Kyocera” reference, in view of United States Patent 3,821,590 by Kosman et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Kosman” reference, in further view of United States Patent 4,600,977 by Barlian et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Barlian” reference. Claim 9 is dependent on Claim 8 and recites additional limitations, and Claim 15 is dependent on Claim 14 and recites additional limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Barlian does not overcome the shortcomings of Kyocera and Kosman.

Serial No.: 10/669,986

Examiner: Payne, Sharon E.  
Art Unit: 2875

That is, Applicants respectfully submit that Barlian, alone or in combination with Kyocera and Kosman, does not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 8 and 14 cited above, and therefore Claims 8 and 14 are considered allowable over Kyocera, Kosman, and Barlian. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 9 and 15 are allowable as being dependent on allowable base claims.

Claims 10, 11, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Application 2002/232017 by Kyocera, hereinafter referred to as the “Kyocera” reference, in view of United States Patent 3,821,590 by Kosman et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Kosman” reference, in further view of United States Patent 6,186,649 by Zou et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Zou” reference. Claims 10 and 11 are dependent on Claim 8 and recite additional limitations, and Claims 16 and 17 are dependent on Claim 14 and recite additional limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Zou does not overcome the shortcomings of Kyocera and Kosman. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that Zou, alone or in combination with Kyocera and Kosman, does not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 8 and 14 cited above, and therefore Claims 8 and 14 are considered allowable over Kyocera, Kosman, and Zou. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 10, 11, 16, and 17 are allowable as being dependent on allowable base claims.

Claims 12 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Application 2002/232017 by Kyocera,

Serial No.: 10/669,986

Examiner: Payne, Sharon E.

Art Unit: 2875

hereinafter referred to as the “Kyocera” reference, in view of United States Patent 3,821,590 by Kosman et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Kosman” reference, in further view of United States Patent 1,340,443 by Gleason et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Gleason” reference. Claim 12 is dependent on Claim 8 and recites additional limitations, and Claim 18 is dependent on Claim 14 and recites additional limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Gleason does not overcome the shortcomings of Kyocera and Kosman. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that Gleason, alone or in combination with Kyocera and Kosman, does not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 8 and 14 cited above, and therefore Claims 8 and 14 are considered allowable over Kyocera, Kosman, and Gleason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12 and 18 are allowable as being dependent on allowable base claims.

Claims 13 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Application 2002/232017 by Kyocera, hereinafter referred to as the “Kyocera” reference, in view of United States Patent 3,821,590 by Kosman et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Kosman” reference, in further view of United States Patent 6,715,901 by Huang, hereinafter referred to as the “Huang” reference. Claim 13 is dependent on Claim 8 and recites additional limitations, and Claim 19 is dependent on Claim 14 and recites additional limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Huang does not overcome the shortcomings of Kyocera and Kosman. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that Huang, alone or in combination with Kyocera and Kosman, does not show or suggest the limitations of

Serial No.: 10/669,986

Examiner: Payne, Sharon E.

Art Unit: 2875

Claims 8 and 14 cited above, and therefore Claims 8 and 14 are considered allowable over Kyocera, Kosman, and Huang. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 13 and 19 are allowable as being dependent on allowable base claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-19 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 1/4/16

  
James P. Hao  
Registration No. 36,398

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060